

## CHAMBERLAIN TALKS, TOO.

HE FOLLOWS MONSIEUR IN WORDS OF WARNING TO FRANCE.

The British Secretary of State for the Colonies Dismisses All Doubt That Sir Edmund's Speech at Paris Was Part of England's Policy to Warn France That "Twisting the Lion's Tail" Must Be Abandoned—France Keeping Open a British Quarrel in Russia's Interest—Referring to the President's Message, Mr. Chamberlain Says Great Britain Will No Longer Stand Alone as Guardian of the Open Door—If Assured of the Friendship of the Anglo-Saxon Race, "No Combination Could Make Us Afraid."

Special Cable Despatches to The Sun.

LONDON, Dec. 8.—In a speech at Wakefield, Yorkshire, to-night Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, dispelled any doubt as to Sir Edmund Monson's speech in Paris being part of England's policy to warn France that "twisting the lion's tail" must be abandoned. He said that Sir Edmund's speech was a warning to France that "twisting the lion's tail" must be abandoned. He said that Sir Edmund's speech was a warning to France that "twisting the lion's tail" must be abandoned.

The gravest part of Mr. Chamberlain's speech was the most moderate. His references to Russia were not only moderate, but they were also moderate. He said that Russia was not a purely French quarrel. The British challenges will probably be repeated until France sees that this is the case, and, disgusted, may leave Russia to protect for herself.

Mr. Chamberlain was enthusiastically received. He said that the future was unsettled. It depended upon the possibility of coming to an understanding with France. Friendship was incompatible with the policy of exasperation and twisting the lion's tail, which had been pursued for so many years.

Regarding Russia, Mr. Chamberlain said he had gone to war to prevent Russia from taking Port Arthur or because it was suspected that she had ulterior motives that had not yet been disclosed. Great Britain, he added, was negotiating with Russia for a friendly agreement when that nation occupied Port Arthur. There were no insurmountable obstacles to an agreement giving equal opportunities to the trade of all nations. He was sanguine of such a result, because Japan, Germany and the United States had all identical interests. The American President, in his recent message to Congress, pointed out that the future was unsettled. In the future, then, Great Britain should not stand alone as guardian of the open door.

Continuing, Mr. Chamberlain said that the Government's opponents charged that it was inconsistent to be at one time boasting of England's splendid status and at another time begging for alliances. He said that the Government was not at one time boasting of England's splendid status and at another time begging for alliances. He said that the Government was not at one time boasting of England's splendid status and at another time begging for alliances.

Any alliance must be for mutual interest and the advantages must be for both on one side. Great Britain did not want Germany to pull her chestnuts from the fire; neither would she pull Germany's, but she might have in the future come into collision with Germany, and Germany, and that their joint influence would be used on the side of peace and unrestricted trade.

Mr. Chamberlain contended that the better understanding with Germany was one of the Government's successes. He still more rejoiced at the growth of friendship between the two countries, and he said that the Government was not at one time boasting of England's splendid status and at another time begging for alliances.

In conclusion Mr. Chamberlain said: "The United States are already the greatest of the civilized States. If we were assured of the friendship of the Anglo-Saxon race, under the Stars and Stripes or the Union Jack, there is no combination that could make us afraid."

Mr. Cambo, the newly appointed French Ambassador, arrived in this city yesterday, and will present his credentials to-morrow.

The Paris correspondent of the *Daily News* says he understands that M. Cambo will ask Lord Salisbury whether he authorized Sir Edmund Monson's speech at Paris, according to the correspondent, the opinion grows that Sir Edmund spoke for Lord Salisbury, who is tired of dealing with Ministers who behave as if their power was too ephemeral for them to decide upon any compromise, each Foreign Minister leaving every decision to his successor.

The idea seems to have been to appeal over the heads of the Ministers to the French nation, whose trading classes at least have every reason to desire the continuance of good relations with England.

The correspondent further says that while the negotiations of British politicians at home are probably not reported beyond Paris, and are hardly heard in the country generally, Sir Edmund's speech will penetrate every café and home where a newspaper is read.

The Paris correspondent of the *Chronicle* says that in an interview a statesman, who has twice held the post of French Minister of Foreign Affairs, declared that he did not regard Sir Edmund Monson's speech as oversteering the bounds of professional diplomacy. The occasion of the speech was as extra-territorial as if the banquet at which it was made had been given at the British Embassy. He said one of Lord Dufferin's speeches, which reached a similar hubbub.

The statesman added that if Sir Edmund, in alluding to short-lived Ministers, intended to tell that Ministerial instability was one of the plagues of France, his utterance was friendly and salutary. He did not believe that Sir Edmund had been instigated by Lord Salisbury.

FRENCH COMMENT ON SIR EDMUND'S SPEECH.

PARIS, Dec. 8.—This morning's newspapers raise a greater clamor over Sir Edmund Monson's speech than yesterday's issues set up. The *Matin* contains a bantering article on the "new diplomacy," in which the paper attempts to show the "foolishness" of the British Ambassador's course.

The *Elabor* says it fails to find any possible excuse or reason why the British Ambassador should employ such language.

The *Radical* declares that Sir Edmund, even in the opinion of his countrymen, has been guilty of gross indiscretion.

The *Autorité* even finds ground for reaffirming

## SPAIN'S AGONY AT AN END.

TREATY FINISHED AND MAY BE SIGNED TO-MORROW OR MONDAY.

A Skeleton of the Document It Will Contain, It Is Believed, Fourteen Articles—Matters Not Connected with the Protocol Not Raised—United States to Return All Spanish Arms from the Philippines and to Repatriate the Spanish Troops.

Special Cable Despatches to The Sun.

PARIS, Dec. 8.—To-day's session of the Joint Peace Commission lasted from 2 o'clock until 5 1/2 this afternoon. The Americans were first to speak, and the French then followed. The treaty was signed and nothing remained but to be signed on Monday and possibly on Saturday.

None of the Commissioners could state the exact number of articles the treaty would contain, but Secretary Moore said there would be not more than twelve. They would consist, he said, of the essential features of the protocol and matters relating thereto. Matters not connected with the protocol had not been raised, having been left until after the resumption of diplomatic relations between Spain and the United States.

The American held a conference this morning, and agreed to keep the treaty absolutely secret until it is reported to the Senate.

Señor Ojeda, Secretary of the Spanish Commission, who has taken his country's misfortune greatly to heart, was ill with a cold to-day and was confined to his bed. Señor Villaurrutia, of the commission, acted as secretary in his absence.

The difficulty in stating the number of articles in the treaty arose from the fact that they have not yet been drafted in perfect form. Señor Villaurrutia, of the American Commission, will meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning for the purpose of drafting them.

There is reason to believe that the number of articles will be fourteen, a skeleton of which is appended:

First—The relinquishment of Cuba.

Second—The cessation of hostilities. The other Spanish possessions in the Philippines and Guam.

Third—The cessation of the Philippines and the payment of \$20,000,000 by the United States.

Fourth—The release of prisoners of war and the evacuation of the Philippines.

The fifth article deals with the return of public archives and documents and regulates the terms concerning the surrender of public buildings and property.

The sixth article, which was only finally agreed to to-day, treats of the national status of Spaniards remaining in the ceded territory.

The seventh provision for the mutual abandonment of all indemnity for national or private claims.

The eighth concedes privileges for ten years to ships under the Spanish flag trading with the Philippines.

The foregoing are the essential articles and will be probably as numbered. Though the details of the subsequent articles have not been determined, the ninth will possibly arrange for the release of all political prisoners connected with the insurrections.

In the tenth article the United States will advise the Cuban Government to accept the obligations falling on it under this treaty.

The eleventh provides for religious liberty. The twelfth deals with the powers and jurisdictions of Consuls.

The thirteenth treats of copyright, patents and port charges.

In the fourteenth the commissions respectively recommended the ratification of the treaty by the Senate and the Queen Regent.

The United States undertakes to return all the Spanish arms and flags from the Philippines, and also to repatriate from the islands, at the expense of the United States Government, all the Spanish troops.

The correspondent of *The Sun* was favored with an interview to-day by Judge Day and Senator Gorman who were together. Both declined to give any information regarding the treaty, explaining that to do so would be a breach of etiquette and of the Senate's privileges. It was the duty of the Commissioners, they said, to report to the President, who would communicate with the Senate.

Replying to a query respecting the attitude of their Spanish colleagues, both spoke highly of their personal qualities, adding that they thought the members of both commissions entertained mutual respect.

The correspondent asked Senator Gray to state how the Spanish Commissioners had received the treaty. "They feel bitterly the calamities that have befallen their country, which they were powerless to prevent or remedy. The task given them was a thankless one, though they have done their best."

The Americans agree that the Spaniards bear the blame for the war with dignity. The Commissioners were to have been photographed in a body to-day, but Judge Day, noting the absence of Secretary Ojeda, suggested that it be postponed until the next meeting, when the last article, referring to the ratification of the treaty by the respective Governments, will be read.

Judge Day referred to Señor Montero Rios and said: "His Excellency will not be in the least object to this."

The President of the Spanish Commission replied with brightness: "I wish the treaty could be signed to-night."

It is difficult to say which side is the better pleased. The treaty has been reached—the Spaniards that finally the agony is ended, or the Americans that a period has been put to the painful but necessary operation which may prove Spain's salvation.

LONDON, Dec. 8.—A Central News despatch from Paris says that the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States will contain fifteen articles, and that the signatures will be affixed on Saturday or Monday. The despatch also says that at the end of to-day's session Señor Montero Rios read a protest, declaring that Spain's submission to the American terms was due to force.

Rome, Dec. 8.—While it is admitted that the Pope aims to save the ecclesiastical properties in the Philippines, it is denied that the Vatican is seeking at Washington to obtain a declaration of the neutrality of such properties.

SPAIN REJECTS OUR PRAYERS.

Billed Chaplain Milburn's Petition Regarded as an "Indelicate Burlesque."

Special Cable Despatches to The Sun.

MADRID, Dec. 8.—Indignation has been caused by a petition from the United States' refusal to submit the question of the responsibility for the destruction of the Maine to foreign arbitration. Spaniards say it is adding insult to injury and taking unfair advantage of circumstances to deny justice to a nation which is unable to resent such a course.

The prayer of the Chaplain of the Senate at the opening of Congress, in which he acknowledged the blessing of God on the Queen Regent, King Alfonso, and the Spanish people, has also caused great irritation, especially in exalted quarters, where it is regarded as an indelicate burlesque.

A majority of the newspapers favor the idea of selling all the remaining Spanish possessions in the Pacific to Germany and other European nations.

Hawaii, Japan or China.

Via the shortest transatlantic route, the New York Central, "America's Greatest Railroad," connecting New York with London, Liverpool, and the great through air line between the East and the West, New York Central Ticket Agent for information.

## A VICTORY FOR PIQUART.

Court of Cassation Suspends the Court-Martial—Calls for the Secret Testimony.

PARIS, Dec. 8.—The Court of Cassation to-day rendered its decision in favor of the suspension of Col. Piquart's court-martial. M. Athalin is a well-known barrister, who was appointed by the court to report to it the proper procedure with reference to the precedence of the court-martial of Piquart or the revision of the case of Dreyfus.

This session the Court of Cassation, at which the postponement of the Piquart court-martial was decreed, was public. The proceedings were exceedingly dignified. There was a complete absence of partisan demonstrations.

After M. Athalin's report had been submitted, the venerable Procurator-General, M. Manau, addressed the court, endorsing M. Athalin's conclusions. He contended that the two tribunals, namely, the Correctional Court and the court-martial, before which the appellant was summoned, held conflicting views. The former regarded the *petit bleu* as a genuine document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

The court-martial, however, regarded the *petit bleu* as a document that had been forged by the accused, and therefore a treasonable document, and therefore an innocent one so far as the accused was concerned, but for this very reason considered that Piquart had committed a misdemeanor in communicating it to M. Leblois, because, being genuine, it was connected with the defense and safety of the State.

## CHICAGO TALKS VIOLENCE.

TUMULT OVER EXTENDING THE STREET CAR FRANCHISES.

Associated Press Promises Not to Expose City Corruption if the Extension Ordinance Is Repealed—Inter Ocean Declares Editors of Other Papers Anarchists—Mayor Is Outspoken for Mob Law.

CHICAGO, Dec. 8.—One of the liveliest fights the City Council has known was waged to-day with the question of granting to the street railway companies of Chicago an extension of their franchises for fifty years. The present franchises will expire in 1901 and the men who own the large interests are naturally anxious to know what encouragement they are to expect for a further investment of their capital.

In the proposed ordinance granting the fifty-year extension, which was presented to the Council on Monday night, the street railway men offered to pay the city as compensation in proportion to the earnings of their roads from one-half to 1 per cent. when the earnings are \$7,500 to \$10,000 a mile, up to 3 per cent. where the earnings are \$20,000 a mile or more.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.

The proposition was referred to the joint Committee on Streets and Alleys, which has held daily sessions to consider it. The newspapers of Chicago, with one exception, have condemned the measure as a mammoth steal from the city and the citizens.